## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES FILED

	2008 JUL -3 AM 10: 21 This space for Clark in Office File Storm
TO: -	TRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
TO: U. S. DIS' FROM: L. Hamme	/
	7408 WQH (BLM) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff
CASE TITLE: Daughtery v. Wilson et al	
	TLED: Motion and Request for Issuance of Civil Subpoena
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:	
✓ Local Rule	Discrepancy
5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate
7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
7.1	Missing table of contents
15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
	Supplemental documents require court order
	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
$\square$	OTHER: No Original Signature
	Date forwarded: <u>6/30/2008</u> ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:	
The documen	t is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.	
Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate?  Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers	
Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1	
	CHAMBERS OF: Major
Dated: $\frac{7/2}{cc}$	108 By: Law clerk